



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the feasibility of its doctrine, the underlying idea is deeply spiritual.

If I have expressed a few views different from the author's, it was not in cavil; on the contrary, I regard this book as a delightful and healthy contribution for which we have every reason to be thoroughly grateful.

CAMILLO VON KLENZE.

University of Chicago.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Some Principles of Literary Criticism, by C. T. WINCHESTER, Professor of Eng. Lit. in Wesleyan University. London and New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899.

PROFESSOR WINCHESTER is well known to the American Literary public as one of the editors of the Athenæum Series; as the author of an excellent little manual entitled, *Short Courses of Reading in English Literature*, as an efficient member of the Modern Language Association of America, and of the Commission of Colleges in New England on English Admission Examinations.

In the preface to the volume now before us for examination, the author tells us, "that he has attempted neither to expound a philosophy of criticism nor to elaborate a critical method; but simply to state some qualities that by common consent are to be found in all writing deserving to be called literature, and to lay down some fundamental principles that must be assumed in all sound critical judgments."

To this province and purpose, Prof. Winchester has strictly and, in the main, successfully confined himself. The results, however, as we believe, would have been more satisfactory had he given us, in a condensed form, "a philosophy of criticism," and had he discussed, in accordance with the title of his book, literary criticism, rather than literature itself.

After an introductory chapter on, "Definitions and Limitations," he proceeds to define literature, to unfold the four cardinal elements that enter into it,—Emotion, Imagination, Thought, and Form,—closing with a study of Poetry and Prose Fiction.

The statement, as the outset, "that of the three methods of approach to literature, biographical, historical, and critical, literary criticism is concerned only with the third,"

needs modification. Literary criticism has to do with literature at every point of it, in every phase of it, and with every approach to it, especially so, as what may be called the affinities and relations of literature were never more apparent and important than they are now. Moreover, to the author's definition of literature, serious objection must be taken, a definition which goes far to impair the value of the volume. We refer to the extraordinary place which he gives to Emotion. "It is the power to appeal to the emotions," he says, "that gives a book permanent interest, and, consequently, literary quality." All other elements must be subordinated to this and explained by it, and the Professor adds the peculiar statement, "that it is the very transiency of emotion which makes a book of lasting interest." This, to our mind, is a contradiction in terms, not defensible as a theory or in the light of literary history. On such an hypothesis, one is puzzled to see what we are to do with the great intellectual masterpieces of literature, even with the mental side of poetry and fiction. Much of the best literary product of Bacon and Wordsworth, and Coleridge and Browning, and George Eliot and Emerson, must thus be ruled out of court. We find emotion in these authors, it is true, but "intellectualized emotion." Prof. Winchester, in referring to De Quincy's "literature of knowledge and of power," while rightly insisting that all true literature must move men, strangely errs in maintaining that men cannot be moved save through the medium of the feelings. His own discussion of the imagination, intellect, and taste, as expressed in literature, is inconsistent with such a position. In fact, the author is better than his theory and, as he goes on, wittingly or unwittingly teaches a saner doctrine, as he says "that there can be no really profound emotion without something great in the underlying ideas."

It is thus that the submitted definition of Poetry—"That variety of the Literature of Emotion which is written in metrical form"—is a faulty one in its narrowness; the imagination, the taste, and even the intellect not being sufficiently emphasized. In fine, the author's conception of literature, as thus expressed, is too limited and exclusive, and fails to note the

essentially different ways in which the emotions stand related to prose and verse, respectively, and to the respective types of prose and of verse. Forensic prose, and lyric and tragic verse, are emotional in a sense and to a degree not at all applicable to other forms of literature, such as narrative and critical prose, or narrative and descriptive verse, and yet any one of these forms is as truly literature as any other. These comments apart, Prof. Winchester's volume is marked by mature thinking and helpful suggestion; is pervaded by a profound literary seriousness, and an absorbing desire to find and state the last and best word on the various topics discussed. His emphasis of the importance of personality in literature; his reflections on the relation of art to the ideal and the real; his insistence that literary form is based on substance; and his protest against the Experimental School of Zola and the naturalistic tendencies of Modern Fiction, are all indicative of clear thinking and a highly worthy aim to be of valid service in the cause of truth and letters. Moreover, it is in place to say, that it is, in many respects, gratifying to see the Baconian style of Elizabethan days reproduced in modern English prose.

TH. W. HUNT.

Princeton University.

MEDIÆVAL DRAMA.

Jacques Milet's Drama "*La Destruction de Troye la Grant*," its principal source, its dramatic structure, by THOMAS EDWARD OLIVER (Heidelberg dissertation). Heidelberg: 1899. 8vo, pp. 257.

IN the prologue to his play Milet twice mentions its principal source. The story of Troy, he says, had been written before his time "*En latin et en prose laye*" (cited by Dr. Oliver on p. 11), for which reason he will avoid repetition by dramatizing the matter. Accordingly, returning to his home he finds "*ung livre ouvert Faisant des troyans mencion*" (Oliver, p. 12), and begins his history of Troy. The Latin work he mentions has been supposed to be Guido de Colonna's *Historia Trojana*. The "*prose laye*" may have been a French version of Benoit's *Roman de Troie*, or perhaps a translation of Guido. The "*livre ouvert*" may

have been the *Historia*. It could not have been the translation, since Milet states, at the end of his prologue, that his drama was translated from Latin into French (Oliver, p. 11). The purpose of the dissertation in regard to the source of Milet is to see whether this Latin book was Guido's.

Many writers, however, have claimed in spite of Milet's words, that Benoit's poem is the real original of *La Destruction*. Dr. Oliver has, therefore, made a double comparison, between Milet and Guido, on the one hand, and Milet and Benoit on the other. This comparison he has carried on passage for passage and line for line, notwithstanding the absence of critical editions of either of Milet's assumed predecessors. The results of so minute an investigation are given on pages 10 and 11 of the dissertation in these words:

"there exists *no* direct relationship between Milet and Benoit, . . . on the contrary, wherever, in an episode common to all three, Benoit's relation differs from Guido, Milet invariably follows Guido, not Benoit. Negatively also, wherever Guido omits anything in Benoit, Milet omits it also. . . . His main source at least is a work in Latin and that work is Guido's. That here and there traces of other influences occur, in no case however of Benoit, will be seen."

These conclusions of the author seem wholly supported by the facts adduced throughout his work. Variations from Guido are either due to Milet's creation of new situations, or occur only in unimportant details. A short summary of these differences would have been useful.

A second object of the dissertation is to determine the merit of Milet as a dramatist, through a careful study of the structure of the play. The results which the author has reached are not tabulated, but may be found under the various subdivisions which were used in the investigation of the source. They might be summarized in somewhat the following order: Milet shows a liking for monologues, justified by the tendency of the plays of his day, for dreams, for fixing on his characters certain traits or attributes, for scenes between lovers and for dialogue passages. It is quite interesting to note that while Milet's dialogue varies most agreeably the plain narrative he could extract from Guido's prose, it is decidedly inferior in dramatic qualities to the lines of Benoit which might correspond. Indeed Milet seems